

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526).

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended the specification and independent claims 1 and 5 to more clearly define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending for consideration.

Applicant concurrently submits herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the drawings do not show the "third digital to analog converter" recited by claims 4 and 7, and the "level shifter" recited by claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings include an amended drawing FIG.

4 that shows a third digital to analog converter 5c, as recited by claims 4 and 7, a level sifter 4, as recited by claim 5, and corresponding amplifiers 10a, 10b to 10n. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the features of the claims are shown in the drawings, and respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526), claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293), claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon, and claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al.

Applicant traverses these rejections as being based upon combinations of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features now clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 5, and hence dependent claims 2-7.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination including at least "a plurality of digital to analog converters for converting digital image signals output from the timing controller to analog image signals based on a color gray level displayed and receiving the selection signal." In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant's Related Art data driving circuit does

not include a timing controller that outputs a selection signal provided to a plurality of digital to analog converters. Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's disclosed Related Art. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Suzuki et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicant's disclosed Related Art and any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 041501-5479

Application No.: 10/034,185


Page 11

37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy

Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: February 10, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004